



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,192	12/05/2006	Vega Mesignani	PAT051912-US-PCT	8434
27476	7590	10/07/2011		
NOVARTIS VACCINES AND DIAGNOSTICS INC.				
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY- X100B				
P.O. BOX 8097				
Emeryville, CA 94662-8097			EXAMINER	
			FORD, VANESSA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2011	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>		<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
10/552,192		MASIGNANI, VEGA	
<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
VANESSA L. FORD		1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2011.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

5) Claim(s) 2,5,6,12-27 and 29 is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) 17-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

7) Claim(s) 1,5,6,12-16 and 29 is/are rejected.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

9) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11) The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- 1) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- 2) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 3) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's amendment filed September 12, 2011 has been entered. Claims 2 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1, 4, 7-11 and 28 have been canceled. Claim 29 has been added. Claims 17-27 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on March 1, 2010.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 12-16 and 29 are under examination.

2. It should be noted that claim 15 has an incorrect status identifier. Claim 15 should be labeled (withdrawn) instead of (previously presented).

***Rejections Withdrawn***

3. In view of Applicant's amendment and response the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), pages 3-5, paragraph 4 of the Final Office action have been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 12-14, 16 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The claims are drawn to an isolated protein comprising a polypeptide exhibiting at least 70% sequence identity to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 with one or more mutations that reduce or eliminate ADP-ribosylating activity of the protein. The claimed invention encompasses any deletions or substitution along the amino acid sequence as set in SEQ ID NO. 1.

To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the

claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention. To adequately describe the claimed genus of polypeptides, Applicant must adequately describe the antigenic determinants or the amino acids that are required for the recited ADP-ribosylating activity as recited in the claims.

The specification, however, does not disclose distinguishing and identifying features of a representative number of members of the genus of polypeptides to which the claims are drawn, such as a correlation between the *structure and function* so that the skilled artisan could immediately envision, or recognize at least a substantial number of members of the claimed genus of polypeptides. It should be noted that the instant specification states "The amino acid sequence of an ADP-ribosylating toxin from *Listeria monocytogenes* is given in SEQ ID NO:1. The existence of ADP-ribosylating toxins in this bacterial species has not been suggested and furthermore, there is only a low level of sequence identity this toxin and toxins such as the iota toxin from *Clostridium perfringens*" (pages 1-2). Therefore, the skilled artisan cannot look to the state of the art to determine or predict ADP-ribosylating toxin activity. The specification nor the state of the art leads the skilled artisan to the amino acids within SEQ ID NO:1 that is responsible for ADP-ribosylating toxin activity. The instant specification has not provided written description for the claimed invention with respect to providing an isolated protein comprising a polypeptide exhibiting at least 70% sequence identity to

the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 with one or more mutations that reduce or eliminate ADP-ribosylating activity of the protein. Applicant has identified preferred mutations in Table 1, page 38 of the instant specification and newly submitted claim 29. The preferred mutation in Table 1 appears to be substitution and/or insertion mutations. How do these mutations disclose an isolated protein that is 70% identical to SEQ ID NO:1? As stated above, the instant specification discloses that the existence of ADP-ribosylating toxins in this bacterial species has not been suggested and furthermore, there is *only a low level of sequence identity this toxin* and toxins such as the iota toxin from *Clostridium perfringens*" (pages 1-2). One skilled in the art cannot look to the state of the art or the specification to find guidance as how to identify mutations in SEQ ID NO.1 that would arrive at the structure of 70% identity to SEQ ID NO:1 and have no or reduced ADP-ribosylating activity.

Protein chemistry is probably one of the most unpredictable areas of biotechnology. Consequently, the effects of sequence dissimilarities upon protein structure and function cannot be predicted. Bowie et al (*Science*, 1990, 257:1306-1310) teach that an amino acid sequence encodes a message that determines the shape and function of a protein and that it is the ability of these proteins to fold into unique three-dimensional structures that allows them to function, carry out the instructions of the genome and form immunoepitopes. Bowie et al. further teach that the problem of predicting protein structure from sequence data and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein is extremely complex. (column 1, page 1306). Bowie et al further teach that while it is known that many amino

acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the position within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of maintaining function are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the three dimensional structure/function relationship and these regions can tolerate only conservative substitutions or no substitutions (column 2, page 1306).

MPEP § 2163.02 states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, 'does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed' ". The courts have decided:

The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, whatever is now claimed.

See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001)

state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of variant species, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The Guidelines further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (Id. at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species within the genus.

Hence, only a polypeptide with an amino acid sequence comprising of SEQ ID NO:1 meets the written description requirements.

***Status of Claims***

5. No claims allowed.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VANESSA L. FORD whose telephone number is (571)272-0857. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am- 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571.272.0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vanessa L. Ford/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645  
September 30, 2011